

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 are presently pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 10, and 13 have been amended and claims 18-21 have been added by way of the present Amendment. Claims 3, 5, 12, and 14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is introduced by this amendment. (See, e.g., page 4, line 11, through page 5, line 18; page 15, line 30, through, page 16, line 18; page 16, line 23, through page 17, line 18; and FIGS. 3-5.)

The Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments set forth in the Response filed on March 25, 2009.

The Applicants want to thank Examiner Jae Y. Lee and Supervisory Patent Examiner Daniel J. Ryman for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Christopher D. Ward, during the interview conducted on May 6, 2009. During the interview, the obviousness rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 (as set forth in the Response filed March 25, 2009) was discussed, as well as the obviousness rejection of dependent claims 4, 5, 13, and 14.

In the outstanding Office Action, claim 1 was objected to for minor informalities; claims 1, 2, 6-11, and 15-17 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0105911) in view of *Bahadiroglu* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0186660); and claims 3-5 and 12-14 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi et al.* and *Bahadiroglu* in view of *Leftwich* (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,256).

The Office Action objected to claim 1 for the recitation of "the at least one service access point" and has suggested a change thereto. As discussed during the interview, the independent

claims have been amended to change the phrase “service access points’ in the preambles thereof to “at least one service access point” in order to correspond to the recitations in the bodies of the claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this objection.

With regard to the rejections of the claims as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Applicants note that subject matter of claims 5 and 14 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Additionally, claims 4 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, the discussion below is with respect to the obviousness rejection based on the combined teachings of *Pruthi et al.* and *Bahadiroglu* in view of *Leftwich*.

The Applicants submit that there is no evidentiary support for the conclusion that the features recited in the claims were known at the time of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicants request that such evidentiary support be placed on the record, or the obviousness rejections withdrawn.

Independent claim 1 recites that the display device is configured to display **a marking produced automatically by the selector in the second region based on a predefined additional item of information** stored during storage of messages in the storage device. Independent claim 10 recites during storage of the messages in the storage device, **a predefined additional item of information is stored, and dependent upon the predefined additional item of information, a marking is produced automatically in the second region by the selector.**

With respect to previously pending claims 5 and 14, the Office Action notes that *Pruthi et al.* and *Bahadiroglu* do not disclose markings produced automatically by the selector. The Office Action cites *Leftwich* for the teaching of such a feature, specifically citing the cursor (46) depicted in FIG. 4 of *Leftwich*. As discussed during the interview, *Leftwich* does not disclose a

marking that is produced automatically based on a predetermined additional item of information, in the manner recited in amended claims 1 and 10. The cursor (46) is merely a selection tool is produced automatically based on a predetermined additional item of information. As discussed in the present application, embodiments of the present invention advantageously provide that a marking can be automatically produced based on some additional item of information, such as a specific event, etc., that triggers the selector to automatically produce a marking (see, e.g., markings 34.1 or 34.2 in FIGS. 3-5). No such automatically produced marking is taught in *Leftwich*, or the remaining applied references, either when taken singularly or in combination.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of independent claims 1 and 10.

The claims that depend from claims 1 and 10 are considered allowable for the reasons advanced for the independent claim from which they respectively depend. These claims are further considered allowable as they recite other features of the invention that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the applied references when those features are considered within the context of their respective independent claim.

Independent claim 4 recites that **a plurality of specific points are marked by respective markings in the course** displayed in the second region and, upon selection of a marking of the markings, a sequence of messages which corresponds to the specific point of the selected marking is read in from the storage device. Independent claim 13 recites in the second region, **a plurality of specific points of the course of the first characteristic feature are marked by respective markings**, and upon selection of a marking of the markings, dependent upon the specific point marked by the selected marking, a corresponding sequence of messages is read in by the selector from the storage device.

With respect to previously pending claims 4 and 13, the Office Action notes that *Pruthi et al.* and *Bahadiroglu* do not disclose marking at least one specific point and selection of the marking. The Office Action cites *Leftwich* for the teaching of such a feature, specifically citing the cursor (46) depicted in FIG. 4 of *Leftwich*. As discussed during the interview, *Leftwich* does not disclose a plurality of specific points that are marked by respective markings, in the manner recited in amended claims 4 and 13. Even assuming for the sake of argument that the cursor (46) is considered a marking, no such plural markings are possible in *Leftwich*. As discussed in the present application, embodiments of the present invention advantageously provide that a plurality of specific points on the course can be marked with markings (see, e.g., markings 33.1, 33.2, 33.3, and 33.4 in FIGS. 3-5). No such markings are taught in *Leftwich*, or the remaining applied references, either when taken singularly or in combination.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of independent claims 4 and 13.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9957 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

May 11, 2009
Date

/Christopher D. Ward/
Christopher D. Ward
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,367

Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,658

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9957
Fax (703) 519-9958